IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH.

Crl. Revn. No. 1005 of 2006

DATE OF DECISION : 16.01.2007

Lakha Singh

.... PETITIONER

Versus

Uggar Singh and others

..... RESPONDENTS

CORAM :- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SATISH KUMAR MITTAL

Present: Mr. V.K. Sandhir, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. N.S. Gill, AAG, Punjab.

* * *

Petitioner Lakha Singh, who is complainant in case FIR No. 60 dated 30.8.1997 under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 34 IPC, registered at Police Station Jhunir, has filed this revision petition against the judgment dated 12.12.2005, passed by Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Mansa, whereby the respondents have been acquitted of the charge framed against them. The State of Punjab has not filed any appeal against the impugned judgment of acquittal.

2. I have heard counsel for the petitioner and the State Counsel and perused the impugned judgment passed by the trial court.

3. The allegation against the accused-respondents is that they are misappropriating the ration meant for the villagers by making false ration cards of the persons, who are not residing in the village for the last 10-12 years and are having ration cards at the places where they are residing.

4. The trial court, after taking into consideration the evidence led by the prosecution, has held that the prosecution has failed to produce and prove the alleged forged ration cards. The signatures of accused Gurcharan

Singh on those ration cards has also not been proved. The court further found that even it has not been proved that those forged ration cards were ever used by the accused persons. In view of these findings, the trial court has acquitted the accused while holding that the prosecution has failed to prove the alleged forgery and intention of using the alleged forged documents beyond shadow of reasonable doubt.

5. After hearing the arguments of counsel for the petitioner, I do not find any illegality or infirmity in the impugned judgment. From the evidence available on record, in my opinion, no second view is possible. No ground for interference in the impugned judgment is made out.

6. Dismissed.

January 16, 2007 **(SATISH KUMAR MITTAL)**
ndj **JUDGE**